

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part C**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18 (2018-19)**

**Missouri**



**PART C DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

##### Missouri Part C Infrastructure

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is the lead State agency responsible for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention system, known as First Steps, is comprised of: (A) regional System Point of Entry offices; (B) a Central Finance Office; and (C) early intervention providers.

A. Regional System Point of Entry Offices: The State is divided into ten early intervention regions. The State of Missouri contracts with a single entity (System Point of Entry or SPOE) in each of the ten regions. The SPOEs are responsible for the local administration of the program, including referral, intake, eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development. All service coordination activities are provided by the SPOE.

B. Central Finance Office: The State of Missouri also contracts with a CFO whose responsibilities include: enrolling and paying providers; fiscal management; and conducting regular reviews of provider accounts to ensure providers continue to meet the criteria as qualified personnel, including completion of module training, a review of provider licensure, liability insurance and criminal history checks. The CFO also maintains the State's child data system. The CFO provides a support help desk to trouble-shoot problems with users, which helps DESE ensure accurate data are entered in the system.

C. Early Intervention Providers: Early intervention services are delivered by providers who meet DESE's qualifications. All providers enroll as individuals who are independent vendors or affiliated with an agency. SPOEs organize and coordinate providers into Early Intervention Teams (EIT). EIT is Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. Each EIT must include at least one Service Coordinator, Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist and Special Instructor. The number of teams per region is determined by the SPOE.

The EIT serves as the main source of providers for families in the Part C program. IFSP services are provided using a primary service provider approach where one professional from the team, or primary provider, is chosen by the IFSP team to serve as the main support to the family. Families requiring services from disciplines other than those represented on the EIT (i.e., ancillary providers) will receive those services from other disciplines enrolled with the CFO.

#### Lead Agency Staff

DESE's Office of Special Education employs staff in the Early Intervention section who are responsible for implementing and monitoring the Part C program. The early intervention section consists of: (A) Part C Coordinator; (B) regional Area Directors; and, (C) compliance staff.

A. Part C Coordinator: The Part C Coordinator oversees the implementation of the regulations and contractual obligations of the SPOEs and CFO, and coordinates with multiple State agencies including other sections at DESE. The Coordinator is also responsible for the supervision of the regional Area Directors and compliance staff.

B. Regional Area Directors: There are five Area Directors located in State offices throughout the SPOE regions. Each Area Director provides guidance and technical assistance in the areas of child find, public awareness, SPOE operations, compliance requirements and best practices related to early intervention for two SPOE offices. The Area Directors also conduct annual provider trainings and monthly monitoring of provider billing practices.

C. Compliance Staff: There are two Compliance staff that conduct annual compliance monitoring, document any findings of noncompliance and verify timely correction of all identified noncompliance. This staff is also responsible for investigating child complaints related to the Part C program.

#### WebSPOE Data System

DESE operates a secure, web-based child data system called WebSPOE. The system contains all elements of a child's record, including referral, evaluation, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation. Data are entered in real-time and are accessible based on a user-level access in order to maintain privacy. The system is compliance driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice. SPOEs utilize the system to record child and family demographic information and enter authorizations for providers to deliver early intervention services. Providers utilize the system to record progress notes, submit claims for delivered early intervention services and review payment history.

Given the extent of data available in WebSPOE, the system has become an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system. Staff in the Early Intervention section utilize the system to conduct compliance monitoring and service monitoring activities.

#### General Supervision System

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.**

##### Compliance Monitoring Procedures

The ten SPOEs are monitored each year for compliance with SPP/APR indicators. The monitoring data reported in this SPP/APR were obtained through desk reviews of individual child records in accordance with the State's compliance monitoring procedures. The desk reviews included information from both hard copy records and data in WebSPOE. At least one randomly selected record was reviewed from all Service Coordinators with a minimum of six months of First Steps experience.

During the 2018-19 monitoring, if the SPOE had 80% to 99% compliance on an indicator, then the SPOE had an opportunity to correct the instance prior

to a finding being issued. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs had to be corrected: (1) the child level, with each individual case of noncompliance corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) the SPOE level, with the SPOE providing documentation from new files, demonstrating compliance with the indicator. If the SPOE was able to demonstrate correction of both prongs prior to a finding being issued, then no finding was issued and no corrective action was required.

However, if the SPOE had 79% or less compliance on an indicator, then a finding was issued and a corrective action was required for that indicator. The SPOE did not have the opportunity to correct these instances prior to a finding being issued.

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the regulations. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

#### Service Monitoring Procedures

All early intervention services delivered in the Part C program are subject to Federal, State and local monitoring. As part of the provider agreement to deliver early intervention services and as part of the SPOE contract requirements, providers and SPOEs must participate in routine monitoring of the services delivered to families in early intervention. Providers are required to meet and maintain all standards, guidelines and policies for early intervention, including proper billing practices. Staff in the Early Intervention section conduct regular monitoring in order to verify providers are documenting and claiming services in accordance with State guidelines and instructions.

Examples of service monitoring procedures include a review of: the number of hours a day that providers billed for early intervention services; the number of missed visits; and complaints about provider billing practices. For each activity, staff in the Early Intervention section review claims and progress notes to verify there is sufficient documentation to substantiate payments to providers. Additional documentation to support the provider payment may be requested from the provider. Staff may provide technical assistance to a provider regarding recordkeeping and billing practices.

#### Dispute Resolution System

The Missouri Part C complaint system includes three options to resolve disputes: (A) child complaint; (B) due process hearing; and, (C) mediation.

A. Child Complaint: A child complaint may be filed by any person or organization who believes there has been a violation of any State or Federal regulation implementing Part C of the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with DESE, Office of Special Education, unless it is determined the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by Compliance staff in the Early Intervention section. Decisions are issued within 60 calendar days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made. If DESE, the SPOE or the provider is found out of compliance, DESE addresses in its decision how to remediate the noncompliance. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the parts of the complaint being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to individual child complaints and track timelines for resolution of child complaints.

B. Due Process Hearing: Requests for a due process hearing must be made in writing to DESE, Office of Special Education. A Hearing Officer is assigned to conduct the hearing and issue a written decision within 30 days of the receipt of the request, unless the timelines have been extended by the parties.

If DESE or the parent disagrees with the Hearing Officer's final decision, either party has a right to appeal the decision to a State or Federal district court. The decision of the Hearing Officer is a final decision unless a party to the hearing appeals. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to due process requests and track timelines for due process hearing requests.

C. Mediation: Requests to settle disagreements through mediation may be made at any time, including prior to initiating a child complaint or due process hearing or after a child complaint or due process hearing has been requested. Both parties must agree to enter into mediation and agree on an impartial mediator selected from a list of qualified and trained mediators maintained by DESE. If mediation is successful, then a written agreement is developed and signed by the parent and a DESE representative. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings. Mediation must be completed within 30 days of the decision to mediate. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to mediation cases and track timelines for mediation requests.

#### Technical Assistance System:

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.**

##### System Point of Entry Contract

The State of Missouri contracts with a single System Point of Entry (SPOE) to operate the Part C program in each of the ten regions of the State. The current contract began on July 1, 2019 and runs on a five year cycle. Each agency awarded the contract employs certain staff, including a SPOE Director and a sufficient number of Service Coordinators and support staff to administer the program within the designated region.

On an annual basis, staff in the Early Intervention section review specific SPOE contract standards for child count, compliance, early intervention teams, IFSP meeting activities and a needs assessment plan. If a SPOE does not meet at least the minimum performance for each standard, liquidated damages are applied and a technical assistance plan is created to assist the SPOE with operations in the region.

The current SPOE contract contains requirements for working with families participating in Part C, including: (A) compliance standards; (B)

transdisciplinary teams; and, (C) needs assessment.

A. Compliance Standards: Per contract requirements, each SPOE must comply with Federal and State regulations for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and other laws or regulations related to the State's Part C program. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators, with help from the Area Directors. DESE conducts annual compliance monitoring to ensure SPOEs are implementing the regional program according to Federal and State regulations.

B. Transdisciplinary Teams: Per contract requirements, each SPOE implements early intervention teams of providers to conduct evaluation and assessment activities and deliver early intervention services to families of children with disabilities. Missouri's team model was established using best practices for serving children in natural environments according to nationally recognized recommended practices. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to providers delivering services in the designated region, with help from the Area Directors.

C. Needs Assessment: Per contract requirements, each SPOE agency completes an annual needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment is to use data to identify the strengths and challenges in the regional system and identify areas that need training or technical assistance for Service Coordinators and providers in the region. The needs assessment may include observations of intake visits, IFSP meetings and provider practices in home visits. Each SPOE Director is responsible for using multiple data sources to inform any adjustments to the regional plan, with help from the Area Directors.

#### Statewide and Regional Technical Assistance

Staff in the Early Intervention section provide technical assistance in two ways: (A) statewide technical assistance; and, (B) regional technical assistance.

A. Statewide Technical Assistance: Staff provide guidance and instructions to SPOEs and providers on various topics related to Part C requirements, including: timely services; parental consent; the 45-day timeline; and transition from Part C to Part B. General Part C information is available statewide through the DESE website, including written documents such as a practice manual and recorded webinars. In June of each year, staff in the Early Intervention section provide face-to-face training for SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators to reiterate requirements and best practices in service delivery.

Additionally, information related to evidence-based practices in early intervention is provided to SPOEs and providers, including: natural environments; home visiting practices; child outcomes and effective transitions. Guidance documents on evidence-based practices are available on the DESE website. On an annual basis, Area Directors provide training to SPOEs and providers to reinforce best practices for serving children with disabilities.

B. Regional Technical Assistance: In addition to statewide technical assistance, targeted technical assistance may be provided to a region based on a collection and review of different types of data in Missouri's Part C program. The need for regional technical assistance may be determined from a review of quantitative data (e.g., data posted monthly on the DESE website, canned reports available in the WebSPOE) or qualitative data (e.g., surveys of provider or Service Coordinator needs for additional information, training or meeting post-assessments, concerns about the quality of provider practices).

Targeted technical assistance is not intended to be a statewide activity, rather assistance to a specific region based on an identified need. However, if multiple regions are having the same issue, targeted technical assistance may become a statewide activity.

Through placing high emphasis on scheduled, statewide technical assistance, regular data reviews, targeted technical assistance and problem solving, staff in the Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive technical assistance system for Missouri's Part C program.

#### Professional Development System:

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

##### Online Training Modules

The State has online training available to provide basic information about the Part C program. There are eight modules available to service providers that includes an orientation to the Part C program and addresses the process of assessment, identification of appropriate levels of service, family engagement, delivery of services in the natural environment and providing evidence based practices. The seventh module, Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO), is currently only available to Service Coordinators and providers participating in the State's SSIP project. In 2018-19, the State released the eighth online module, Foundational Practices in Early Intervention, to Service Coordinators and providers. This module focuses on evidence-based practices, effective team practices and providing services in the natural environment.

Each module includes content, video, resources and an assessment to measure competency related to the topic addressed in the module. The modules are provided at no-cost to the general public; however, individuals enrolling in the Missouri Part C program as an early intervention provider or Service Coordinator must successfully complete assessments. Individuals enrolling as an early intervention provider are required to complete the first module, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to enrollment. Providers have six months from initial enrollment to complete the second, third and fourth modules. Modules five, six and eight are optional for providers.

However, individuals enrolling as Service Coordinators complete the online training modules, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to accepting a caseload.

The online training modules are reviewed and updated on an annual basis to ensure the content is consistent with all Federal and State regulations or State laws governing the Missouri Part C program.

##### Transdisciplinary Teams

Missouri began moving to a transdisciplinary team model in 2009 with full implementation in 2013. Missouri's current team model was established using the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like," a document developed by the OSEP TA community of practice for Part C settings. This document outlines the key principles and concepts for delivering services in natural settings as well as examples illustrating what the practice should "look like."

With the implementation of the SSIP in indicator 11, the State has expanded on transdisciplinary teams to allow professional development (PD) time during EIT meetings in Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) pilot regions. PD time allows for 15 to 45 minutes of paid time in EIT meetings to be used for activities that can improve child outcomes such as: practices related to child outcomes areas (e.g., social-emotional development, appropriate behaviors, typical development for infants and toddlers), knowledge of local resources available in the community, and information about child development or developmental milestones.

The topics to discuss during PD time are identified by each EIT and based on the unique needs of the providers on the team. Providers and Service Coordinators on each team may use checklists or tip sheets to use as visual aids. Teams are also allowed to have professionals outside the EIT attend as guest presenters to share information on topics that impact child outcomes (e.g., trauma, parent engagement).

With the new SPOE contract issued in 2019, all SPOE regions were required to develop and implement EIT's with the necessary numbers and required disciplines as established in State guidance. Regions worked with existing EIT's, identified any necessary adjustments to the team structure and conducted evaluations of each teams functioning. The State plans to develop a tool to evaluate EIT effectiveness in the future.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)**

YES

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

DESE reports annually to the public on the performance of the State and each SPOE compared to the targets established in the SPP/APR on indicators one through ten. The public report for each SPOE is compiled at the same time the SPP/APR is being prepared, and is posted within 120 days of the submission of the SPP/APR. In February following the submission to OSEP, the public report for each SPOE, the Part C SPP/APR and other related documents are posted on the DESE website on the SPP/APR page at: <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>. DESE also posts the final SPP/APR, public reports and State determination information on this page.

## Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	69.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.51%	97.25%	97.58%	96.04%	97.30%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
90	111	97.30%	100%	96.40%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

*This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*

17

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

In Missouri, services for infants and toddlers with IFSPs must begin within 30 days of parental consent to be considered timely. Timely services are determined by comparing the date of parental consent for the service to the first date the service was provided.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All ten SPOE's are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

The delays reported are due to four of the ten SPOE regions each having one unacceptable reason for the delay. The reasons for delay ranged from provider scheduling conflicts and provider availability issues to lack of documentation. The reasons vary across regions and service types, resulting in no pattern in the practices of a particular SPOE region or provider type.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	96.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	99.34%	99.39%	99.46%	99.41%	99.39%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	97.00%	97.00%

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	6,942
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	6,980

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6,942	6,980	99.39%	97.00%	99.46%	Met Target	No Slippage



## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$ .
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$ .
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$ .
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$ .
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed}} \right] \times 100$ .

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

#### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus \# of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)}}{\text{\# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus \# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus \# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus \# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)}} \right] \times 100$ .

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

#### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{\# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus \# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)}}{\text{total \# of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)}} \right] \times 100$ .

### Instructions

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

### 3 - Indicator Data

**Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)**

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Due to the continuing work on indicator 3 the State is doing as part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the State is not changing the targets for 2018 and 2019 at this time. The State is moving forward with the 2018 targets at .10% above the baseline. As more regions are included in the pilot, the State expects the decreasing trend for Summary Statement 2 will continue across all outcome areas (i.e., 3a, 3b, and 3c). The State anticipates the SSIP project (ECO pilot) to achieve statewide implementation in 2020, and then the State will consider resetting the baseline and subsequent targets for Indicator 3.

Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction for more information.

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>A1</b>	2009	Target>=	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%
<b>A1</b>	69.10%	Data	79.89%	82.65%	87.22%	88.36%	90.28%
<b>A2</b>	2009	Target>=	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
<b>A2</b>	47.40%	Data	31.76%	26.81%	25.97%	22.57%	21.26%
<b>B1</b>	2009	Target>=	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%
<b>B1</b>	70.30%	Data	81.70%	84.62%	88.63%	90.03%	91.53%
<b>B2</b>	2009	Target>=	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
<b>B2</b>	45.50%	Data	33.67%	21.35%	19.18%	17.04%	16.37%
<b>C1</b>	2009	Target>=	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%
<b>C1</b>	73.00%	Data	82.48%	84.40%	88.73%	90.09%	91.17%
<b>C2</b>	2009	Target>=	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%
<b>C2</b>	36.10%	Data	25.82%	26.75%	26.26%	22.66%	20.20%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	69.20%	69.20%
Target A2>=	47.50%	47.50%
Target B1>=	70.40%	70.40%
Target B2>=	45.60%	45.60%
Target C1>=	73.10%	73.10%
Target C2>=	36.20%	36.20%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

4,061

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	65	1.60%

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	308	7.58%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2,946	72.54%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	575	14.16%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	167	4.11%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,521	3,894	90.28%	69.20%	90.42%	Met Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	742	4,061	21.26%	47.50%	18.27%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Missouri made improvement and met all targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas. Results for Summary Statement 1 indicate children who enter Part C below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exit.

However, Missouri had slippage and did not meet targets for Summary Statement 2 in each of the three outcome areas. Results indicate children may make progress while participating in Part C but are not functioning at age expectation by the time they exit. The State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data more accurately reflects the State's eligibility criteria since Missouri has a half-age delay in development (i.e., narrow criteria) and does not serve infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays.

Additionally, the State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data for Indicator 3 is a reflection of the data quality improvement activities conducted under Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). In Phase I of the SSIP, the state determined the collection and determination of child outcome ratings were: (1) not consistent within or between regions in the state; (2) not frequent enough to accurately report progress; and (3) not meaningful to the family and other IFSP team members. These three issues were determined to be the root cause for data quality issues in Indicator 3. To address the root cause, the State initiated a pilot project that includes new procedures for discussing, collecting and rating child outcomes.

The pilot began in 2012-13 with two regions implementing the new procedures. Another region was added to the pilot in 2013-14, two additional regions were added in 2016-17, one in 2017-18 and two in 2018-19. Currently, eight of the ten regions are participating in the pilot. The State examined regional data reported over the past three years and found a distinct difference between pilot regions and non-pilot regions. The pilot regions showed lower entry and exit scores, which is impacting the statewide data for this indicator.

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	93	2.29%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	246	6.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,158	77.76%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	489	12.04%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	75	1.85%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their	3,647	3,986	91.53%	70.40%	91.50%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program							
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	564	4,061	16.37%	45.60%	13.89%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Missouri made improvement and met all targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas. Results for Summary Statement 1 indicate children who enter Part C below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exit.

However, Missouri had slippage and did not meet targets for Summary Statement 2 in each of the three outcome areas. Results indicate children may make progress while participating in Part C but are not functioning at age expectation by the time they exit. The State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data more accurately reflects the State's eligibility criteria since Missouri has a half-age delay in development (i.e., narrow criteria) and does not serve infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays.

Additionally, the State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data for Indicator 3 is a reflection of the data quality improvement activities conducted under Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). In Phase I of the SSIP, the state determined the collection and determination of child outcome ratings were: (1) not consistent within or between regions in the state; (2) not frequent enough to accurately report progress; and (3) not meaningful to the family and other IFSP team members. These three issues were determined to be the root cause for data quality issues in Indicator 3. To address the root cause, the State initiated a pilot project that includes new procedures for discussing, collecting and rating child outcomes.

The pilot began in 2012-13 with two regions implementing the new procedures. Another region was added to the pilot in 2013-14, two additional regions were added in 2016-17, one in 2017-18 and two in 2018-19. Currently, eight of the ten regions are participating in the pilot. The State examined regional data reported over the past three years and found a distinct difference between pilot regions and non-pilot regions. The pilot regions showed lower entry and exit scores, which is impacting the statewide data for this indicator.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	74	1.82%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	273	6.72%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,015	74.24%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	587	14.45%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	112	2.76%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,602	3,949	91.17%	73.10%	91.21%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	699	4,061	20.20%	36.20%	17.21%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

Missouri made improvement and met all targets for Summary Statement 1 for each of the three outcome areas. Results for Summary Statement 1 indicate children who enter Part C below age expectations are increasing their rate of growth by the time they exit.

However, Missouri had slippage and did not meet targets for Summary Statement 2 in each of the three outcome areas. Results indicate children may

make progress while participating in Part C but are not functioning at age expectation by the time they exit. The State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data more accurately reflects the State's eligibility criteria since Missouri has a half-age delay in development (i.e., narrow criteria) and does not serve infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays.

Additionally, the State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data for Indicator 3 is a reflection of the data quality improvement activities conducted under Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). In Phase I of the SSIP, the state determined the collection and determination of child outcome ratings were: (1) not consistent within or between regions in the state; (2) not frequent enough to accurately report progress; and (3) not meaningful to the family and other IFSP team members. These three issues were determined to be the root cause for data quality issues in Indicator 3. To address the root cause, the State initiated a pilot project that includes new procedures for discussing, collecting and rating child outcomes.

The pilot began in 2012-13 with two regions implementing the new procedures. Another region was added to the pilot in 2013-14, two additional regions were added in 2016-17, one in 2017-18 and two in 2018-19. Currently, eight of the ten regions are participating in the pilot. The State examined regional data reported over the past three years and found a distinct difference between pilot regions and non-pilot regions. The pilot regions showed lower entry and exit scores, which is impacting the statewide data for this indicator.

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.**

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	5,025
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	865

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.	

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."**

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1-5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Instruments for Collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

The State provides a list of appropriate assessment tools. SPOE staff are not required to use a specific assessment instrument; however, SPOE staff must use three sources of information in order to collect ECO data. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results. In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C SPP/APR.

After reviewing data from the three sources of information used to determine ECO ratings, the State decided to begin a Part C pilot project in 2012-13 to embed the collection of ECO ratings in IFSP meeting activities. In 2018-19 six of the ten regions participated in the pilot and exit data from these regions, as well as the four non-pilot regions, were included in Indicator 3.

**Procedures for Reporting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)**

Each eligible child entering the Part C program must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months. A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely." For regions that are not in the pilot, entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. For regions that are in the pilot, entry and exit data are collected as part of the first and last IFSP meeting with the family. All Part C entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system, WebSPOE. The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings. The State analyzes the outcome data at the end of each fiscal year.

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

#### Measurement

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	92.30%	Data	96.21%	98.64%	98.67%	98.53%	99.30%
B	2006	Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
B	95.60%	Data	97.86%	96.15%	97.22%	96.80%	98.60%
C	2006	Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
C	96.30%	Data	98.23%	97.64%	97.33%	97.60%	98.83%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	95.00%	95.00%
Target B>=	95.70%	95.70%
Target C>=	96.40%	96.40%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	4,261
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	848
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	836
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	844

B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	817
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	842
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	828
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	842

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	99.30%	95.00%	99.05%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	98.60%	95.70%	97.03%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	98.83%	96.40%	98.34%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan.	

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
If your collection tool has changed, upload it here	XXX
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

**If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

In 2018-19, paper surveys were sent to families with children in the program for at least six months. Families were given the option to submit responses online instead of mailing back the paper survey. If a family had more than one child in the Part C program, the family received more than one survey.

The State analyzed two demographic items from 2019-18 survey responses: the region in which the child resides and the child's age. The response rate for each region is similar to the percent of children served in that region. For both families responding and families enrolled in Part C, the average age of the child is two years. Therefore, the State determined the demographics of the families responding are representative of the families enrolled in the program.

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	0.71%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target >=	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%
Data	1.01%	1.14%	1.26%	1.33%	1.33%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	0.80%	0.80%

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	974
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	72,258

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
974	72,258	1.33%	0.80%	1.35%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Compare your results to the national data

Missouri has a narrow eligibility criteria. Missouri is serving a comparable percentage of the State's birth to 1 population as the other states with narrow eligibility criteria (Alaska and Arizona). Missouri is serving 1.35%, Alaska is serving 1.71% and Arizona is serving 0.92%.



## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

### 6 - Indicator Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	1.48%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target >=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	2.22%	2.41%	2.64%	2.87%	2.95%

#### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	2.00%	2.00%

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	6,980
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	221,107

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
6,980	221,107	2.95%	2.00%	3.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Compare your results to the national data

Missouri has a narrow eligibility criteria. Missouri is serving a comparable percentage of the State's birth to 3 population as the other states with narrow eligibility criteria (Alaska and Arizona). Missouri is serving 3.16%, Alaska is serving 2.66% and Arizona is serving 2.34%.

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	90.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	98.21%	98.21%	98.28%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
57	65	98.28%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

8

### What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

### Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

<b>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
1	1	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected****Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected**

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE conducted the initial evaluation, initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting, although late, for any child whose IFSP was not completed within the 45 day timeline, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	60.10%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.47%	89.87%	100.00%	92.59%	93.75%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
62	70	93.75%	100%	90.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance and slippage from the previous year is reported due to three of the ten SPOE regions having noncompliance with this indicator. The noncompliance was a result of Service Coordinators not appropriately documenting the required transition steps and services in the IFSP. In most cases, the required transition steps and services were conducted; however, they were not documented in the IFSP.

The State continues to provide ongoing training and technical assistance to all SPOEs on the topic of transition from Part C in addition to ensuring all noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner consistent with OSEP memo 09-02.

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

1

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected****Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements***

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected**

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE developed a transition plan with steps and services, although late, for any child whose transition plan was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	64.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
67	70	100.00%	100%	98.53%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance and slippage from the previous year is reported due to one of the ten SPOE regions having noncompliance with this indicator. The noncompliance represented an isolated incident where notification to the LEA was delayed for one child.

The State continues to provide ongoing training and technical assistance to all SPOEs on the topic of transition from Part C in addition to ensuring all noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner consistent with OSEP memo 09-02.

**Number of parents who opted out**

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

2

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)**

YES

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$ .

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	57.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.75%	98.75%



## Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

## FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
65	70	98.75%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

4

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

1

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

## Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

## FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE conducted a transition conference with the family, although late, for any child whose transition conference was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NA

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

This indicator is not applicable because Missouri Part C did not adopt Part B due process procedures.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	NA
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	NA

### Historical Data

Baseline	NA	NA			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Data	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	NA	NA

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = ((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri Part C did not establish baseline or targets due to having no mediation data. If in a future reporting period the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, Missouri Part C will develop a baseline and targets.

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data					

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Missouri Part C did not establish baseline or targets due to having no mediation data. If in a future reporting period the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, Missouri Part C will develop a baseline and targets.